

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

2  
3  
4  
5  
6

## 8

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

## 17

18  
19  
20  
21

22

23

24

25

1 that its IP address changes in a manner inconsistent with some of Applicant's  
2 claims. No agreement on the patentability of the independent claims was reached.

### 3 4 **The §102 Rejections**

5 Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as  
6 being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,487,406 to Chang et al. ("Chang et al").

### 7 8 **The §103 Rejections**

9 Claims 6-7 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
10 unpatentable over Chang et al in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,016 to Hulthen et al.  
11 ("Hulthen").

### 12 13 **Argument**

14 Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish that Chang et al  
15 discloses each and every element of Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40 and a *prima*  
16 *facie* case of obviousness in rejecting Claims 6-7 and 24-25. Before discussing the  
17 substance of the Office's rejections, however, a section entitled "The §102  
18 Standard" is provided and will be used in addressing the Office's rejections.  
19 Following this section, a section entitled "The Chang et al Reference" is provided  
20 and describes Chang et al's disclosure, after which Applicant addresses the  
21 Office's grounds for rejecting the pending claims.

### 22 23 **The §102 Standard**

24 Anticipation is a legal term of art. Applicant notes that in order to provide a  
25 valid finding of anticipation, several conditions must be met: (i) the reference must

1 include each and every element as set forth in the claim (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union*  
2 *Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987);  
3 *and see* MPEP §2131); and (ii) the teachings of the reference cannot be modified  
4 (*see* MPEP §706.02, stating that “No question of obviousness is present” in  
5 conjunction with anticipation).

#### 6 7 The Chang et al Reference

8 Generally, Chang et al teaches registering a mobile station when out of its  
9 home subnet effective to forward packets from the mobile station’s old, permanent  
10 IP address to a new, temporary IP address. Chang et al’s network registers the  
11 mobile station by assigning the mobile station a new, temporary IP address. By so  
12 doing, Chang et al’s network can forward packets to the mobile station. *See*  
13 *Chang et al.*

14 More specifically, Chang et al discloses providing seamless mobile IP  
15 connectivity between mobile stations (MS) connected to a PCS network via base  
16 stations (BS) connected to base station switching centers (BSCs). Each MS is  
17 assigned a permanent IP address and associated with a home subnet. When the  
18 system detects that the MS is connected to a BSC outside of its home subnet, the  
19 MS is assigned a care-of address (COA) to which IP data can be forwarded. IP  
20 data from the MS is routed through a gateway router (GR). IP data directed to the  
21 MS is directed to the MS’s permanent IP address. If the MS is connected to a BSC  
22 outside of its home subnet, the data traffic is forwarded to the MS’s care-of  
23 address. Chang et al teaches performing these actions so that Chang et al’s PCS  
24 network may forward data packets to a mobile station. *See Chang et al at*  
25 *Abstract.*

1        Response to Rejections

2        Chang et al teaches altering the IP address at which a mobile station  
3 receives packets. Chang et al registers a new, temporary IP address for a mobile  
4 station so that the mobile station *receives* packets at the new, temporary IP address.  
5 Pending independent claims 1, 19, and 38, however, recite an authorizer,  
6 authorizer signal, authorizer identifier, and/or authorizer network address  
7 concerned with to where packets are *sent* from a mobile client and not concerned  
8 with altering an IP address at which a mobile station receives packets.

9        When Chang et al's mobile station moves, the mobile station's address that  
10 receives packets also changes. The Office relies on Chang et al's manner of  
11 providing a new IP address for a mobile station to anticipate the claimed  
12 authorizer, authorizer signal, authorizer identifier, and/or authorizer network  
13 address. But these are simply not the same. One is a mobile station's IP address  
14 and the other is related to an authorizer agent. One requires that a mobile station's  
15 address change. The other does not.

16        Applicant submits that the Office has failed to establish that Chang et al  
17 discloses each and every element of Claims 1-5, 19-23, and 38-40.

18  
19        *Claims 1-7*

20        For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of  
21 independent Claim 1.

22        Claim 1 recites a method for broadcasting an announcement signal,  
23 comprising:

- 24        ○ broadcasting a network identifier signal that uniquely identifies a  
25        computer network;  
26        ○ broadcasting an authorizer signal that identifies an authorizer  
27        network address on the computer network, the authorizer network

- 1 address being associated with an authorizer that is configured to  
2 authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer network; and  
3 o broadcasting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier network  
4 address on the computer network, the verifier network address being  
5 associated with a verifier that is configured to verify data packets  
6 sent by mobile clients utilizing the computer network.

7 The Chang et al reference has not been shown to disclose each and every  
8 element as set forth in Claim 1 as required by *Verdegaal Bros.*

9 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang et al  
10 discloses the elements of Claim 1 is:

11 As per claim 1, Chang et al teach a method for broadcasting  
12 an announcement signal, comprising:

13 broadcasting a network identifier signal that uniquely  
14 identifies a computer network (**column 5, lines 40-60 and column**  
15 **7, lines 7-17**);

16 broadcasting an authorizer signal that identifies an  
17 authorizer network address on the computer network, the  
18 authorizer network address being associated with an authorizer that  
19 is configured to authorize mobile clients to utilize the computer  
20 network (**column 5, lines 40-60 and column 7, lines 7-17**); and

21 broadcasting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier  
22 network address on the computer network, the verifier network  
23 address being associated with a verifier that is configured to verify  
24 data packets sent by mobile clients utilizing the computer network  
25 (**column 7, lines 7-17 and lines 28-30**).

*Office Action, paragraph 4.*

And from the Office's *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action:

Chang et al teach that a PCS network broadcasts system  
information (**announcement signal**), which includes a PCS  
registration identification (**network identifier signal**), a Base  
station (BS) identification (**authorizer signal**) and a Base

Switching Center (BSC) identifier (**verifier signal**). When a MS moves from one sub network to another, the MS uses the system information broadcast to determine if it has a PCS registration area or not and whether a PCS registration procedure must be performed. The BS provides wireless connectivity to the registered mobile stations. The BCS analyzes data in the received signal to determine if the MS has moved from within the same subnet or from a different subnet by referring to its MS-BS association table. Therefore Chang et al meets the scope of the claimed inventions. (see column 5, lines 10-67, column 8, lines 19-67, column 7, lines 7-56, column 9, lines 15-55)

*Office Action, portion of paragraph 20 from line 21 of page 6 to line 9 of page 7.*

The portions of Chang et al relied on by the Office to reject Claim 1 are:

In operation, system information broadcast by the PCS network and received by each MS 18 includes a PCS registration area identification and a BS identification. Therefore, according to one aspect of the invention, when an MS 18 moves from one BS 16 to another, the MS 18 uses the data in the system information broadcast to determine if it has crossed a PCS registration area or not, and whether a PCS registration procedure must be performed. It can be appreciated that frequent transmission of Mobile IP registration parameters, such as a subnet mask, Agent Advertisement, etc., may consume a large quantity of system information bandwidth. According to a further aspect of the invention, Mobile IP registration parameters are instead conveyed to an MS 18 when a BSC 14 determines that an MS 18 has moved between different subnets. Thus, the information is transmitted to the MS only when it is specifically needed. Various MS registration scenarios will now be discussed with further reference to the example network configuration illustrated in FIG. 3 and the flow diagrams of FIGS. 4 and 5.

*Chang et al, column 5, lines 40-60.*

Upon receiving the Agent Advertisement, the MS sends a datagram (a Mobile IP Registration Request message) to the BSC

1 directed to the MS's HA. The datagram is a conventional LAN  
2 registration message and includes the information provided to the  
3 MS in the BSC's agent advertisement, (e.g., the IP addresses of the  
4 MS, FA, HA, COA, and the lifetime). Upon receiving the datagram,  
5 the BSC does not interpret the message, but instead forwards it to the  
6 present subnet's FA. The FA determines the MS's HA and forwards  
7 the Mobile IP Registration Request message to the HA via one or  
8 more GRs and possibly the Internet.

9 Upon receiving the registration datagram, the HA  
10 authenticates the MS. If the MS has just moved out of its home  
11 subnet and into a foreign subnet, the HA sends a Gratuitous ARP to  
12 all other nodes in the HA's subnet instructing them to associate the  
13 HA's hardware address with the MS's IP address so that datagrams  
14 destined for the MS may be intercepted by the HA and forwarded  
15 appropriately.

16 *Chang et al, column 7, lines 7-17 and 28-34 (lines 31-34 for context).*

17 The Office argues that: "When a MS moves from one sub network to  
18 another, the MS uses the system information broadcast to determine if it has a PCS  
19 registration area or not and whether a PCS registration procedure must be  
20 performed." See *Office Action*, page 6-7. Chang et al's Base Station (BS)  
21 identification is part of the system information. *Id. and see Chang et al.* Chang et  
22 al's PCS registration is concerned with providing a new IP address for a mobile  
23 station. See *Chang at Abstract*. This Base Station identification, then, is used by  
24 Chang et al as part of a process for providing a new IP address for a mobile  
25 station. The Office relies on this Base Station identification to anticipate the  
claimed authorizer, authorizer signal, authorizer identifier, and/or authorizer  
network address. But these are simply not the same. One is concerned with a  
mobile station's IP address and the other is related to an authorizer agent. One  
requires that a mobile station's address change. The other does not.

Specifically, Chang et al's base station identification identifies a base station. Claim 1, however, recites an authorizer network address being associated with an authorizer. Chang et al's base station has not been shown by the Office to be equivalent to the claimed authorizer. Chang et al's base station is concerned, along with other components of Chang et al, with providing a mobile station with a new, temporary IP address. The claimed authorizer is not.

For more detail on these and other reasons showing why the Office fails to show that Chang et al anticipates Claim 1, the Office is referred to the Applicant's prior Response dated September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2005.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

The Office's argument for rejecting Claims 6-7 under 103 does not correct the Office's deficiencies in its rejection of Claim 1, on which Claims 6-7 depend. For at least this reason, Claims 6-7 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claims 6-7 are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

#### *Claims 19-26*

For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of independent Claim 19.



1 Claim 19 recites one or more computer-readable media containing  
2 computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the  
3 following steps:

- 4 ○ transmitting a network identifier signal that identifies an associated  
5 network;
- 6 ○ transmitting an authorizer signal that identifies an authorizer on the  
7 network, the authorizer being configured to authorize client access to  
8 the network; and
- 9 ○ transmitting a verifier signal that identifies a verifier, the verifier  
10 being configured to verify that data packets transmitted to the  
11 network are transmitted from clients that have been authorized to  
12 access the network.

13 Applicant submits that the Chang et al reference has not been shown to  
14 disclose each and every element as set forth in Claim 19 as required by *Verdegaal*  
15 *Bros.*

16 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang et al  
17 discloses the elements of Claim 19 is:

18 As per claims 19-23, these claims contain similar limitations as  
19 claims 1-5 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

20 *Office Action, paragraph 9.*

21 The portions of Chang et al relied on by the Office to reject Claim 1 are set  
22 forth for Claim 1 above.

23 For at least the reasons set forth in the argument relating to Claim 1 above,  
24 the Office has not shown that each and every element of Claim 19 is anticipated by  
25 Chang et al.

Claims 20-23 depend from Claim 19 and are allowable as depending from  
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited

1 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 19, are neither disclosed  
2 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
3 another.

4 The Office's argument for rejecting Claims 24-26 under 103 does not  
5 correct the Office's deficiencies in its rejection of Claim 19, on which Claims 24-  
6 26 depend. For at least this reason, Claims 24-26 are allowable as depending from  
7 an allowable base claim. Claims 24-26 are also allowable for their own recited  
8 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 19, are neither disclosed  
9 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
10 another.

11  
12 *Claims 38-40*

13 For the Office's convenience, Applicant sets forth the language of  
14 independent Claim 38.

15 Claim 38 recites a system, comprising:

- 16 o a network identifier;
- 17 o an authorizer identifier;
- 18 o a verifier identifier;
- 19 o a signal generator configured to generate a signal that communicates  
20 the network identifier, the authorizer identifier and the verifier  
21 identifier.

22 The Chang et al reference has not been shown to disclose each and every  
23 element as set forth in Claim 38 as required by *Verdegaal Bros.*  
24  
25

1 For the Office's convenience, the Office's argument that Chang et al  
2 discloses the elements of Claim 38 is:

3  
4 As per claim 38, Chang et al teach a system, comprising:  
5 a network identifier; an authorizer identifier; a verifier identifier  
6 **(column 7, lines 10-15 and column 5, lines 40-60);**  
7 a signal generator configured to generate a signal that  
8 communicates the network identifier, the authorizer identifier and  
9 the verifier identifier **(column 5, lines 40-55 and column 8, lines**  
10 **40-55).**

11 *Office Action, paragraph 10.*

12  
13 As set forth in the argument for Claim 1 above, Chang et al does not  
14 disclose an authorizer identifier. For at least this reason, the Office has not shown  
15 that each and every element of Claim 38 is anticipated by Chang et al.

16  
17 Claims 39-40 depend from Claim 38 and are allowable as depending from  
18 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
19 features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 38, are neither disclosed  
20 nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
21 another.  
22  
23  
24  
25

## Conclusion

## Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. The Office is encouraged to call the undersigned if any issues remain that prohibit allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 27 Feb 06

By: Michael K. Colby  
Michael K. Colby  
Reg. No. 45,816